



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,325	01/29/2004	Laurence W. Davies	80210-952 ADB	1242
23529	7590	08/07/2007		
ADE & COMPANY INC. 2157 Henderson Highway WINNIPEG, MB R2G1P9 CANADA			EXAMINER RUDDOCK, ULA CORINNA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/766,325

Applicant(s)

DAVIES ET AL.

Examiner

Ula C. Ruddock

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Examiner has carefully considered Applicant's remarks filed May 28, 2007. The previously set forth rejections have been maintained.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/78529 (WO '529) in view of Kaiser (US 5,851,468). WO '529 discloses a pultruded part and a method of preparing a reinforcement mat for the part. The improved reinforcement mat is made up of a number of layers, including a layer having fibers which extend transversely of the mat and binding resin for the fibers. The invention is especially useful for pultrusion of parts for fenestration products (pg 1, ln 9-15). The mat and rovings are primarily glass products, while the resin matrix is a thermosetting material (page 1, ln 26-27). Holes are formed in the mat layers which extend through the thickness of the mat layers and receive binding resin therein for increasing the binding effect of the resin upon hardening of the latter (page 4, ln 16-19). It should be noted that the Examiner is equating the holes in the reinforcing mat to be a scrim as required by the present invention. WO '529 discloses the claimed invention except for the teaching that the fibers are made of metal and that the resin is a thermosetting polyurethane.

Kaiser (US 5,851,468) discloses a reinforcing structural rebar comprising an inner core formed by pultruding reinforcing fibers (abstract). The thermosetting resin is preferably a polyurethane (col 3, ln 34-35). The reinforcing fibers include metal fibers (col 10, ln 66). It would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used Kaiser's thermosetting polyurethane and metal fibers in place of the thermosetting resin and glass fibers of WO' 529, motivated by the desire to create a pultruded article that has a higher tensile strength and structural integrity.

Regarding claims 1, 8, 9, 21, 22, and 23, it has been held that the basis weight of the fibers is a result effective variable. The weight of the fibers will directly affect the strength of the fabric. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have used a fabric having a total quantity of fibers of less than 0.5 ounces per square foot, less than 0.25 ounces per square foot, and less than 0.1 ounces per square foot, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F. 2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). In the present invention, one would have optimized the basis weight of the fibers, motivated by the desire to create a fabric that has increased strength and durability.

Rejection is maintained.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed May 28, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth. Applicant argues that in WO '529, the mat must be necessarily be considerably heavier than the 0.5 ounces per square foot as claimed. This argument is not persuasive because WO' 529 specifically discloses in Examples 2 and 3 that the mat has a weight of 32 grams per square meter, which is equal to 0.105 oz per square foot. This teaching by WO '529 is clearly below Applicant's claims, which require that the mat have a weight

of less than 0.5 ounces per square foot or less than 0.25 ounces per square foot. As a result, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ula C. Ruddock whose telephone number is 571-272-1481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel H. Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/U. C. R./

/Ula C Ruddock/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1771